



*The Housing Authority of
Columbus, Georgia
– Annual MTW Plan – Year 2
Demonstrating Progress*



First Submission to HUD – April 17, 2014

Revised Submission to HUD – August 1, 2014

2nd Revised and 1st Plan Amendment Submission to HUD – September 29, 2014

SUBMITTED BY:
THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF COLUMBUS, GEORGIA

LEADERSHIP TEAM

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. R. Larry Cardin, Chairman
Mr. Charles Alexander, Vice-Chairman
Ruhnell Bankston, Resident
Edgar Chancellor
Kenneth Henson
Carlos Huertas
Jeanella Pendleton

SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM

Mr. J. Len Williams, Chief Executive Officer
Mr. John Casteel, Chief Assisted Housing Officer
Mrs. Beverly LaMee, Director of Community Initiatives
Mrs. Susan McGuire, Chief HR and Risk Management Officer
Mrs. Amy Moore, Chief Real Estate Officer
Mrs. Sabrina Richards, Director of Housing Enterprises Operations
Mrs. Tasheé Singleton, Director of Public Housing Operations
Mrs. Lisa Walters, Chief Financial Officer

I. INTRODUCTION

A. TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

- a. Table of Contents..... 3
- b. Overview of Short-Term and Long-Term Goals and Objectives..... 4

II. GENERAL HOUSING AUTHORITY OPERATING INFORMATION

- a. Housing Stock Information..... 12
- b. Leasing Information..... 15
- c. Wait List Information..... 16

III. PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL REQUESTED

- a. Eliminate Child Support from Income Calculation..... 18
- b. Portability Restrictions..... 32
- c. Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation..... 43
- d. Cap Childcare Deductions..... 51
- e. Rapid Re-Housing (formerly Emergency, Temporary Housing / Rapid Re-Housing) 60
- f. Community Choice – Re-proposed..... 68

IV. APPROVED MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL PREVIOUSLY GRANTED

- a. Implemented Activities..... 84
- b. Not Yet Implemented Activities..... 89
- c. Activities On Hold..... 90
- d. Closed Out Activities..... 90

V. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

- a. MTW Plan: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds..... 91
- b. MTW Plan: Local Asset Management Plan..... 93

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE

- a. Resolution Signed by the Board of Commissioners Adopting MTW Plan..... 94
- b. Beginning and End Dates of Plan's Availability for Public Review..... 94
 - i. Dates, Locations of Public Hearings, and total number of attendees
- c. Description of any Planned or Ongoing PHA Directed Evaluations..... 94
- d. Annual Statement/Performance and Evaluation Report (50075.1)..... 95
- Appendix..... 96
 - Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives..... Appendix A
 - Board Resolution..... Appendix B
 - Certification of Compliance..... Appendix C
 - Public Hearing/Meeting Comments Matrix..... Appendix D
 - For Each Grant with Unexpended Amounts, including estimates..... Appendix E
 - Flat Rent Adjustment..... Appendix F
 - Resolution for Flat Rent Adjustment..... Appendix G
 - Certification of Compliance for Flat Rent Adjustment..... Appendix H
 - Public Hearing/Meeting Comments for Flat Rent Adjustment..... Appendix I

B. OVERVIEW

The Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia (HACG) is located just over 90 minutes southwest of Atlanta, Georgia in Muscogee County. The city and the county, which are a consolidated government, are bordered by the banks of the Chattahoochee River on its west, by the Harris County, GA line to the north, by Talbotton and Marion Counties to its east, and to the south by the Chattahoochee County, GA line.

HACG's desire and need to provide more choices and incentives for "traditional" customers, as well as to address the needs of other populations such as homeless, military, and military veteran families prompted HACG's application for a Moving-to-Work (MTW) designation. HACG officially learned of its MTW status in December 2012.

HACG entered into a 5-year MTW Agreement with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) effective July 3, 2013.

MTW is a national demonstration program authorized by Congress which gives HACG the flexibility to waive certain statutes and HUD regulations pertaining to both housing assistance programs (housing choice vouchers and public housing). Under the MTW Program, participating Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) introduce innovative ideas to HUD to address at least one of the three MTW statutory objectives. The objectives are:

1. Reduce cost and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures;
2. Give Incentives to families with children whose heads of household are either working, seeking work, or are participating in job training educational or other programs to assist in obtaining employment and becoming economically self-sufficient; and
3. Increase housing choices for low-income families.

The MTW activities undertaken by HACG are all designed to promote one or more of the MTW statutory objectives. HACG believes its MTW designation is the result of many years of laying the foundation for innovation at HACG and through the successful management of its housing assistance programs, as well as being an industry innovator.

By way of information, HACG was one of four PHAs designated as a MTW Agency in 2013 by HUD. HUD's action brings the nationwide total of PHAs with the MTW designation to 39. This designation coupled with the facts that HACG is known as a high performer and innovator in the assisted housing industry puts HACG in very select company. HACG has always actively aligned its local and national partners, redefined its procedures and processes, and restructured its management team, which have all contributed to HACG becoming a MTW Agency and maximizing the MTW benefits.

As an MTW Agency, HACG is required to prepare an Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report. This document is the Annual MTW Plan for Fiscal Year 2015 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015). MTW Plans and MTW Reports are required to be prepared in accordance with the specifications laid out in HUD Form 50900 “*Elements of the Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report*”.

For the purposes of this document and the required submission to HUD, an “MTW activity” is defined as any activity that requires MTW flexibility to waive statutory or regulatory requirements.

However, not all activities require MTW authority with which to proceed and this Annual MTW Plan includes such discussions, as well as MTW Activities. Both activities tie into HACG’s strategic plan and agency objectives. Similarly, HACG informs its reader that the Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan (ACOP) and the Administrative Plan (Admin Plan) are updated to account for changes to policy and procedures as a result of its MTW status.

Public Review and Comments:

The Annual MTW Plan was available to the public for their review and comment from **February 27, 2014 to March 29, 2014** at the following locations:

- Columbus Public Library, 3000 Macon Road (reference desk, 2nd floor);
- Citizens Service Center, 3111 Citizens Way (Help Desk on 1st floor);
- HACG’s Central Office, 1000 Wynnton Road (receptionist’s desk);
- HACG’s website: www.columbushousing.org.

In addition to the above means to comment on this document, HACG also held Public Hearings/meetings to receive comments on the Annual MTW Plan on the following dates and locations:

- March 17, 2014 - 1006 Warren Williams Road, Columbus, GA
- March 19, 2014 - 1006 Warren Williams Road, Columbus, GA
- March 19, 2014 - 1121 Fort Benning Road, Columbus, GA
- March 25, 2014 - 1901 Nina Street, Columbus, GA

Comments received prior to April 1, 2014, were addressed by HACG via the Annual MTW Plan.

HACG’s Strategic Plan (Appendix A) is updated annually during the Senior Management Team Retreat that took place in March 2014. The goals are non-MTW goals.

NON-MTW SHORT-TERM GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

During Fiscal Year 2015, HACG seeks to implement new activities and objectives as follows (objectives are not listed in any priority order):

- HACG plans to demolish the **Booker T. Washington Development** in conjunction with its plans to redevelop the site
- HACG plans to implement the **Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program**
 - HACG was selected by HUD to have its full property portfolio to perform as RAD properties;
 - RAD is a HUD program that allows public housing properties to be converted to long-term Section 8 assistance contracts and allows the conversion of expired/terminated tenant-based vouchers to project-based assistance vouchers;
 - HACG will comply with tenant protections enumerated in Section 1.6.C and 1.6.D of Notice PIH-2012-32 (HA), REV-1.
 - During the same demonstration period as MTW, HACG will begin converting its Public Housing (PH) units to become Project-based Voucher units. The first phase of conversions include the following:

NUMBER OF UNITS, BEDROOM DISTRIBUTION, AND UNIT TYPE

Project #	Site Name	0 BR	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR	Total	Type of Units
GA 004000412	Nicholson Terrace	28	71	1	0	0	0	100	Elderly / Disabled
GA 004000416	EJ Knight Homes and EJ Knight Gardens	0	40	52	0	0	0	92	40 Elderly / Disabled; 52 Family
GA 004000418	Ashley Station (Phases I & II)	0	79	56	11	0	0	146	Family
GA 004000420	Arbor Pointe I	0	4	10	4	0	0	18	Family
GA 004000421	Arbor Pointe II	0	4	10	4	0	0	18	Family
GA 004000422	The Cottages @ Arbor Pointe	0	19	0	0	0	0	19	Family
Phase I RAD PH Conversion Total:		28	217	129	19	0	0	393	

- HACG's plan is to conduct a full RAD conversion for its entire portfolio
- HACG will initiate the **Redevelopment of the Booker T. Washington (BTW) Development**
 - HACG has been approved for tax credits to redevelop an aged, outdated, BTW site in similar fashion to earlier tax credit developments at Newton Baker Village and George Foster Peabody Apartments, which have been transformed to Arbor Pointe and Ashley Station respectively
 - Tax credits allow developers to build affordable housing units because developers do not have to raise as much capital because the development project has private investors instead of loans
 - HACG anticipates that a relocation/redevelopment plan will be implemented during Fiscal Year 2015
 - HACG intends to apply for an Elderly Only Designation for Phase I of the BTW redevelopment;
 - The need for the designation is in line with the rising elderly and near elderly population, which comprises 29.1% of the city's total 2010 census population;
 - An Elderly Only Designation is consistent with the jurisdictions affordable housing strategies, which will allow HACG to provide affordable housing units to both elderly residents in Phase I and low-income families in Phase II of the redevelopment.
- HACG will increase its efforts to obtain **Vouchers** to assist disabled and/or homeless families
 - HACG's objective is to actively pursue and accept vouchers that focus on helping the general population, as well as specific segments of the Columbus, GA population
 - **Section 811** – these vouchers aid in providing Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities
 - HACG has been invited to apply for Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers (**VASH**) that help house our military veterans
 - These vouchers have a VA Hospital proximity requirement, which HACG does not meet
 - HACG will pursue avenues of partnership and perhaps request waivers of the proximity requirement in order to serve our large military community more effectively

MTW SHORT-TERM GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

The table below lists the proposed MTW activities HACG seeks to implement in FY15:

Fiscal Year	Activity Name	Description
2015	Eliminate Child Support from Annual Income Calculation (Public Housing Only)	Activity will be implemented during the fiscal year during annual certifications and intends to examine if the exclusion of child support income will provide an operational efficiency to HACG and provide an incentive to residents to increase their household income
2015	Portability Restrictions (Housing Choice Only)	Activity will be implemented during the fiscal year and poses a work requirement for clients that port in or out of Columbus. This activity aims to provide an operational efficiency to HACG and increase the agency's cost savings
2015	Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation (Housing Choice Only)	Activity will be implemented during the fiscal year during annual recertification and interim certification examinations and proposes to simplify Utility Allowance Payments to reduce client and landlord confusion. This activity will help voucher holding families and voucher accepting landlords to be able to search and/or provide for housing more effectively and efficiently
2015	Cap Childcare Deductions	Activity will be implemented during the fiscal year at annual recertification and interim certification examinations and proposes to examine if there is an operational efficiency to HACG, as well as to study if it curtails exorbitant childcare expenses submissions
2015	Rapid Re-Housing Vouchers (formerly Emergency, Temporary Housing / Rapid Re-Housing Vouchers)	Incorporated into Activity 2014.02 - Innovations to Reduce Homelessness. See page 78.
2015	Community Choice	Activity is being re-proposed from FY 2014 and focuses on studying the factors behind housing selections by randomly selected, volunteering families, where families will fall into one of three categories: 1) voucher issued at 120% of Fair Market Rent (FMR) with no restrictions; 2) voucher issued at 120% of FMR with a low-poverty restriction; and 3) voucher issued at the normal FMR - the control group

NON-MTW LONG-TERM GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

An overview of HACG's long-term objectives are as follows (objectives are not listed in any priority order):

- Convert, as feasible, public housing units to project-based voucher units under the **Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program**

- Implement second phase of the **Redevelopment of Booker T. Washington (BTW)**

MTW LONG-TERM GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

- Introduce innovative ideas to improve Cost Effectiveness, Self-Sufficiency, and Housing Choices under the **Moving-to-Work Demonstration (MTW) Program**
- Both MTW and Non-MTW long range goals include investigating viable options and alternatives to decrease homelessness and family displacement

The table on the next page reflects HACG's original long-term projects submitted in FY 2014, but based on Columbus' latest "point in time" count, there appears to be a greater need for rapid rehousing assistance. Therefore, HACG has updated its long-term plans to reflect the needs of the community that it serves. Nonetheless, HACG is committed to Willow Glen II, but timing of the remaining points of the long-term projects have been revised for FY 2015 and/or in future Annual MTW Plans:

Fiscal Year	Project Description	Notes by 2019	No. of Housing Units
2016	Willow Glen II	HACG projects project to be similar to our	30
		Willow Glen stand-alone complex to provide	
		30 units of housing for the chronic homeless	
2016	Booker T. Washington Re-Development I	HACG projects to provide 20 units of	20
		permanent supportive housing in a mixed-	
		income community	
2017	Booker T. Washington Re-Development II	HACG projects to provide 30 units of	30
		permanent supportive housing in a mixed-	
		income community	
2018	Willow Glen III	HACG projects project to be similar to our	20
		Willow Glen stand-alone complex to provide	
		20 units of housing for the chronic homeless	
2019	Louis Chase Re-Development	HACG projects to provide 20 units of	20
		permanent supportive housing in a mixed-	
		income community	
Additional Units of Permanent Supportive Housing:			120

II. OPERATING INFORMATION

As of June 30, 2014, HACG's public housing stock was as follows:

AMP No. / Project No.	Property Name / Address	No. of Units	Studio	1 - Bdrm	2 - Bdrm	3 - Bdrm	4 - Bdrm	5 - Bdrm	Special Use Units
HACG PUBLIC HOUSING SITES									
AMP 1 GA 004000402	Booker T. Washington 500 5th Avenue	392	0	155	142	94	0	0	1
AMP 2 GA 004000405	Warren Williams / George Rivers 1200 Warren Williams Road / 1050 Adair Avenue	184	0	40	102	39	0	0	3
AMP 3 GA 004000406	Luther C. Wilson 3400 8th Avenue	289	0	51	145	68	20	4	1
AMP 4 GA 004000407	Louis T. Chase 120 20th Street	108	0	14	47	35	12	0	0
AMP 5 GA 004000408	Elizabeth E. Canty 100 20th Avenue	249	0	41	125	70	10	2	1
AMP 6 GA 004000410	E.E. Farley 1901 Nina Street	102	0	0	22	66	14	0	0
AMP 7 GA 004000412	Brown Nicholson 1313 14th Street	100	28	71	1	0	0	0	0
AMP 8 GA 004000416	E.J. Knight / E.J. Knight Gardens 3811 Baker Plaza Drive / 3610 Youman Street	92	0	40	52	0	0	0	0
AMP 9 GA 004000418	Ashley Station I & II 2321 Olive Street	146	0	81	54	11	0	0	0
AMP 10 GA 004000420	Arbor Pointe I 1312 Gazebo Way	18	0	4	10	4	0	0	0
AMP 11 GA 004000421	Arbor Pointe II 1402 Cupola Place	18	0	4	10	4	0	0	0
AMP 12 GA 004000422	The Cottages @ Arbor Pointe 1454 Cupola Place	19	0	19	0	0	0	0	0
HACG PUBLIC HOUSING TOTAL:		1,717	28	520	710	391	56	6	6

AMP No. / Project No.	Property Name / Address	No. of Units	Studio	1 - Bdrm	2 - Bdrm	3 - Bdrm	4 - Bdrm	5 - Bdrm	Special Use Units
HACG OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING SITES									
Project 420	Arbor Pointe I Project-Based Vouchers 1312 Gazebo Way	75	0	15	45	15	0	0	0
Project 421	Arbor Pointe II Project-Based Vouchers 1402 Cupola Place	75	0	15	45	15	0	0	0
Project 422	The Cottages @ Arbor Pointe Project-Based Vouchers 1454 Cupola Place	101	0	101	0	0	0	0	0
Project 600	Columbus Villas Project-Based Multi-Family 6016 Georgetown Drive	88	0	12	64	12	0	0	0
Project 630	Willow Glen Project-Based Vouchers 2971 Buena Vista Road	28	0	28	0	0	0	0	0
HACG OTHER HOUSING TOTAL:		367	0	171	154	42	0	0	0
GRAND TOTAL HACG HOUSING:		2,084	28	691	864	433	56	6	6

Within the Public Housing stock are a number of units that meet the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS). The tables on the next pages reflect those units:

HACG Public Housing UFAS Units		
Project	Address	# of Units
GA 004000405	Warren Williams 1200 Warren Williams Road	7
GA 004000406	Luther C. Wilson 3400 8th Avenue	9
GA 004000407	Louis T. Chase 120 20th Street	8
GA 004000408	Elizabeth Cauty 100 20th Avenue	15
GA 004000416	E.J. Knight & E.J. Knight Gardens 3811 Baker Plaza Drive & 3610 Youman Place	8

HACG Public Housing UFAS Units cont'd		
Project	Address	# of Units
GA 004000418	Ashley Station I & II 2321 Olive Street	29
GA 004000420	Arbor Pointe I 1312 Gazebo Way	2
GA 004000421	Arbor Pointe II 1402 Cupola Place	0
GA 004000422	The Cottages @ Arbor Pointe 1454 Cupola Place	2
HACG Handicapped Unit Total:		80

A. MTW Plan: Housing Stock Information																				
Planned New Public Housing Units to be Added During the Fiscal Year																				
AMP Name and Number	Bedroom Size							Total Units	Population Type *	# of UFAS Units										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6+			Fully Accessible	Adaptable									
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A									
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A									
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A									
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A									
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A									
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A									
N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Total Public Housing Units to be Added								0												
* Select Population Type from: Elderly, Disabled, General, Elderly/Disabled, Other If Other, please describe: N/A																				
Planned Public Housing Units to be Removed During the Fiscal Year																				
PIC Dev. # / AMP and PIC Dev. Name	Number of Units to be Removed		Explanation for Removal																	
Amp 1 GA 004000402 Booker T. Washington	192		HACG has poured maintenance funds into structures that have survived long past their designed life cycle. The development has reached a point of overwhelming cost to operate and maintain these 72 year old buildings. These Public Housing units are being removed from HACG's public housing stock and being converted to Project-Based voucher units as a result of RAD These Public Housing units are being removed from HACG's public housing stock and being converted to Project-Based voucher units as a result of RAD																	
Amp 9 GA 004000418 Ashley Station I & II	146																			
Amp 10, 11, 12 GA004000420, 421, 422	55																			
Arbor Pointe I, II, & III																				
Total Number of Units to be Removed	393																			

In addition to public housing units managed by HACG, the agency also oversees the administration of the Housing Choice Voucher Program, commonly known as Section 8 or HAP (Housing Assistance Payments). At the beginning of Fiscal Year 2014, HACG's voucher count and assignment was as follows:

Voucher Type	Assignment	No. of Units
Tenant-Based	Various Locations	2,054
Project-Based	Arbor Pointe I	75
Project-Based	Arbor Pointe II	75
Project-Based	The Cottages @ Arbor Pointe	101
Project-Based	Willow Glen	28
GRAND TOTAL HACG VOUCHERS:		2,333

New Housing Choice Vouchers to be Project-Based During the Fiscal Year			
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Description of Project	
Ashley Station I & II	146	This is part of the RAD conversion from PHA to PBV	
Arbor Pointe I, II, & III	55	This is part of the RAD conversion from PHA to PBV	
N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	
Anticipated Total New Vouchers to be Project-Based	201	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	480
		Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year	480
*New refers to tenant-based vouchers that are being project-based for the first time. The count should only include agreements in which a HAP agreement will be in place by the end of the year.			

Other Changes to the Housing Stock Anticipated During the Fiscal Year

HACG has been selected to participate in HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program. HACG will phase from a traditional PHA with traditional PH units to a voucher only PHA over time.

HACG will redevelop Booker T. Washington (BTW) Apartment Homes in phases. The demolition phase will reduce HACG's PH units by 391 and the redevelopment phases will include 100 units for the elderly in phase I and 106 mixed-income units in phase II. Housing stock changes will begin in FY 2015 and may extend through FY 2017.

As a result of the redevelopment initiative, HACG has requested 340 tenant-based vouchers.

Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

General Description of All Planned Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

Capital Funds will be expended on the following areas: Physical Improvements, Management Improvements, PHA-Wide Non-Dwelling Structures and Equipment, Administration, Operations, Fees & Costs, and Section 8 Landlord payments. Capital Funds will be expended on costs associated with the Booker T. Washington (BTW) (GA 004000402) redevelopment. Phase I of the project includes, but are not limited to demolition, relocation, consultants, non-dwelling structures and equipment, construction, and other reasonable and necessary costs (see short-term goals and objectives). Capital Funds will be expended on site software and fiber optic cables agency wide.

B. MTW Plan: Leasing Information

Planned Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year

MTW Households to be Served Through:	Planned Number of Households to be Served*	Planned Number of Unit Months Occupied/ Leased***
Federal MTW Public Housing Units to be Leased	1,455	17,464
Federal MTW Voucher (HCV) Units to be Utilized	2,759	33,108
Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Property-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Number of Units to be Occupied/Leased through Local, Non-Traditional, MTW Funded, Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Total Households Projected to be Served	4,214	50,573

* Calculated by dividing the planned number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.

** In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/households to be served, the PHA should estimate the number of households to be served.

***Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the PHA has leased/occupied units, according to unit category during the fiscal year.

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements

If the PHA has been out of compliance with any of the required statutory MTW requirements listed in Section II(C) of the Standard MTW Agreement, the PHA will provide a narrative discussion and a plan as to how it will return to compliance. If the PHA is currently in compliance, no discussion or reporting is necessary.

N/A

Description of any Anticipated Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers and/or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Possible Solutions

Housing Program	Description of Anticipated Leasing Issues and Possible Solutions
Housing Choice Vouchers	HACG does not anticipate any issues related to this housing program
Housing Choice Vouchers - Community Choice	HACG does not anticipate any issues related to this housing program
Public Housing	HACG does not anticipate any issues related to this housing program

C. MTW Plan: Wait List Information

Wait List Information Projected for the Beginning of the Fiscal Year

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type**	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed***	Are There Plans to Open the Wait List During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Community-wide	130	Closed	Yes
Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program	Program Specific - 30 slots	55	Partially Open	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Community-wide	1,919	Open	Yes

Rows for additional waiting lists may be added, if needed.

* *Select Housing Program*: Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program; Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units; Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.

** *Select Wait List Types*: Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described in the Rules for Program Participation), None (If the Program is a New Wait List, Not an Existing Wait List), or Other (Please Provide a Brief Description of this Wait List Type).

*** For Partially Open Wait Lists, provide a description of the populations for which the waiting list is open.

A portion of HCVs are assigned to Activity 2014.01, Community Choice; the current Wait List will be used to solicit volunteer families to participate in the activity and will be randomly assigned to one of the 3 evaluation groups.

A portion of HCVs are dedicated to Activity 2014.02, Innovation to Reduce Homelessness, which is designed to help reduce the area's homeless population. Vouchers are issued on a referral basis, thus the Wait List is considered partially open.

If Local, Non-Traditional Housing Program, please describe:

N/A

N/A

N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A

N/A

N/A

If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative detailing these changes.

In the interest of fairness and to give all "new" HCV families an equal opportunity, HACG proposes converting its time stamp HCV waiting list selection process to a HCV lottery selection waiting list process for all new families beginning July 1, 2014. Existing families (130) on the HCV time stamp waiting list will continue on that list until it is exhausted.

III. PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL REQUESTED

HACG proposes the following new activities for FY15 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015).

2015.01 - Eliminate Child Support from Income Calculation (Public Housing Only)

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITY:

HACG proposes to examine whether or not the exclusion of child support income from the Annual Income Rent Calculation will provide an efficiency to the rent calculation process for the Public Housing Program, as well as provide an incentive for public housing families to seek and maintain employment or complete their education.

HACG recognizes that child support payments are an inconsistent source of income for many public housing custodial parents, even during prosperous economic conditions. Also, HACG recognizes that child support income usually does not amount to a sustainable amount, especially when it is the sole source of income for a family.

Due to the inconsistent nature of child support payments, HACG Public Housing Managers spend an inordinate amount of time conducting interim certification examinations because previously verified court orders for child support payments are not being followed and/or enforced. Because the court order is not being enforced by the state and/or not being adhered to by the non-custodial parent, the custodial parents living in public housing are put in a situation where the custodial parents may not be able to meet their rent obligation, although the rent was legitimately calculated based on the verified child support order. In similar fashion, the changes in income require housing managers to spend valuable time recalculating income and adjusting rents instead of managing the property and working with families.

Instead of spending valuable time recalculating income and adjusting rents for the non-payment of rent, HACG believes it to be more cost effective to exclude child support payments from the resident's annual income total for rent calculation. This action provides a two-fold benefit to HACG and the Public Housing resident. First, interim examination requests are reduced, which allows Housing Managers to focus on helping other families and maintaining their property. Second benefit is to the custodial parent, where pressure is relieved that the family may not have to relocate as a result of non-payment of rent due to child support not being collected. Consequently, a by-product benefit of the activity may increase the disposable income of custodial parents that are receiving regular child support payments, which may help custodial parents to care for their child(ren).

HACG anticipates that only family developments will "benefit" from this income calculation activity, but the activity applies to any Public Housing Head of Household that produces evidence of child support income.

HACG expects to implement this activity at each family's next annual/interim recertification examination as follows:

1. Housing Managers will calculate all countable income as normal during annual and interim re-certification examinations;
2. Housing Managers will adjust countable income
 - a. Deduct and reduce annual income as usual
 - i. Childcare, dependents, grants, medical, etc...
3. Child Support Income will be verified and entered into the system and then excluded from the Rent Calculation
4. Rent will be calculated based on the adjusted income amount

B. DESCRIBE HOW ACTIVITY WILL ACHIEVE ONE OR MORE OF THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES:

HACG believes that the elimination of Child Support Income from the Annual Income Rent Calculation will achieve two of the three Statutory Objectives, 1) Cost Effectiveness and 2) Self-Sufficiency:

- This activity will meet the Cost Effectiveness objective because it . . .
 - Reduces the amount of time housing managers spend conducting annual/interim certification examinations. Frees up time for Housing Managers to help other families and maintain site;
 - Reduces the number of errors in rent calculation. Ensures Housing Managers are charging the correct rent to the residents based on their adjusted income sources;
 - Reduces the number of resident visits to the rental office requesting interim changes due to an inconsistent income source.
- This activity may also meet the Self-Sufficiency objective because it . . .
 - Provides an increased disposable source of income to the household, which can be used directly for needs, such as clothing, childcare, transportation and similar, by that reducing the dependence on governmental and charitable assistance for basic needs;
 - Presumes that the "elimination" of Child Support Income from the Annual Income Rent Calculation will incentivize residents to want more disposable income and consequently, motivate residents to seek employment, seek better pay, seek more education, seek to improve skills, seek to open child support cases against the non-custodial parent and seek other opportunities to help increase the family's economic independence.

These outlined results promote efficient time management and performance effectiveness for the organization and promote economic independence and housing self-sufficiency for HACG residents.

C. IDENTIFY AND DISCUSS THE ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF ACTIVITY ON STATED OBJECTIVES:

- Anticipated impacts of this activity include:
 - Reducing interim exams and errors in rent calculation by housing managers, assistant housing managers, and temporarily assigned employees
 - Increasing time for managers to manage the property, maintain the buildings, and help families
 - Increasing the disposable income to public housing residents to care for their children
 - Promoting incentives such as more disposable income, increased education, and improving skills in order to seek and maintain employment
- Alternative impacts of this activity include:
 - Increasing disposable income to household does not translate to increased quality of living because “extra” funds do not go toward children or household needs
 - Excluding income causes resident rent to decrease below HACG’s minimum rent (negative rent) and may eliminate the ambition to move out of public housing and into market rate property
 - Encouraging residents to reside in public housing longer than they initially planned because the rent is lower due to the exclusion of child support income

D. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULES FOR ACHIEVING THE STATED OBJECTIVES:

- HACG will implement this activity during the fiscal year upon the adoption of the Annual MTW Plan and approval of proposed activity and anticipates the impacts of the activity to begin being realized in HACG’s 2016 fiscal year forward

E. STANDARD HUD METRICS THAT HACG ANTICIPATES AS A RESULT OF ACTIVITY:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full- Time				
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

F. Baseline Performance Level for each Metric (a numeric value) Prior to Implementation of MTW Activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Average compensation (salary & benefits) of housing managers = \$29.13/hour	Expected average compensation (salary & benefits) of housing managers = \$29.13/hour	Actual average compensation (salary & benefits) of housing managers = Unk/hour	No
	Estimated time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 1.83 hours	Expected time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 1.67 hours	Actual time to conduct annual/interim recertification examination = Unk	
	Number of households with child support listed as an income source = 132 (47 with earned income)	Expected number of households with child support listed as an income source = 132 (47 with earned income)	Actual number of households with child support listed as an income source = Unk (?? with earned income)	
	Cost to Conduct Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Cost to Conduct Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Cost to Conduct Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 7,036.64	\$ 6,421.42	TBD	
	staff dollars	staff dollars	staff dollars	

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Estimated time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 1.83 hours	Expected amount of time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 1.67 hours	Actual amount of time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = Unk hours	No
	Number of households with child support listed as an income source = 132	Expected number of households with child support listed as an income source = 132	Actual number of households with child support listed as an income source = Unk	
	Total Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Recertification Households with Child Support Listed as Income Prior to Implementation of the Activity 241.6 staff hours	Expected Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Recertification Households with Child Support Listed as Income After Implementation of the Activity 220.4 staff hours	Actual Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Recertification Households with Child Support Listed as Income After Implementation of the Activity TBD staff hours	

<i>CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Number of Public Housing files reviewed = 40	Expected number of Public Housing files reviewed = 76	Actual number of Public Housing files reviewed = Unk	No
	Number of files with child support income that have errors = 2	Expected number of files with child support income that have errors = 9	Actual number of files with child support income that have errors = Unk	
	Average Error Rate of Child Support Files Prior to Implementation of the Activity 5.0% errors	Expected Average Error Rate of Child Support Files After Implementation of the Activity 11.9% errors	Actual Error Rate of Child Support Files After Implementation of the Activity TBD errors	

<i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Total earned income of households with both child support and earned income listed as income sources = \$710,346	Expected earned income of households with both child support and earned income listed as income sources = \$710,346	Actual earned income of households with both child support and earned income listed as income sources = Unk	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of households with both child support and earned income listed as income sources = 47	Expected number of households with both child support and earned income listed as income sources = 47	Actual number of households with both child support and earned income listed as income sources = Unk	
	Average Earned Income of Households with Child Support and Earned Income Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Average Earned Income of Households with Child Support and Earned Income After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Earned Income of Households with Child Support and Earned Income After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 15,113.74 average earned income	\$ 15,113.74 average earned income	TBD average earned income	

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:				
(1) Employed Full- Time	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full- Time	<p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = 132</p> <p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Employed Fulltime = 11</p> <p>Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Employed Fulltime</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>8.3%</p> <p>employed fulltime</p>	<p>Expected number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = 132</p> <p>Expected number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Employed Fulltime = 11</p> <p>Expected Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>8.3%</p> <p>employed fulltime</p>	<p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = Unk</p> <p>Actual number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Employed Fulltime = Unk</p> <p>Actual Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>employed fulltime</p>	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - continued

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
(2) Employed Part- Time	<p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = 132</p> <p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Employed Part Time = 36</p> <p>Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Employed Part Time</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>27.3%</p> <p>employed part time</p>	<p>Expected number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = 132</p> <p>Expected number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Employed Part Time = 36</p> <p>Expected Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>27.3%</p> <p>employed part time</p>	<p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = Unk</p> <p>Actual number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Employed Part Time = Unk</p> <p>Actual Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>employed part time</p>	Exceeds Benchmark
(5) Unemployed	<p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = 132</p> <p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Unemployed = 85</p> <p>Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Unemployed</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>64.4%</p> <p>unemployed</p>	<p>Expected number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = 132</p> <p>Expected number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Unemployed = 85</p> <p>Expected Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>64.4%</p> <p>unemployed</p>	<p>Number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source = Unk</p> <p>Actual number of HOHs with Child Support listed as an income source that are Unemployed = Unk</p> <p>Actual Percentage of HOHs with Child Support as an Income Source <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>unemployed</p>	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	<p>Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>37</p> <p>TANF households</p>	<p>Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>37</p> <p>TANF households</p>	<p>Actual Households Receiving TANF After to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TANF households</p>	No

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Public Housing Section 9 subsidy = \$3,525,528	Expected Public Housing Section 9 subsidy = \$4,700,704	Actual Public Housing Section 9 subsidy = Unk	No
	Number of Public Housing units = 13,419	Expected number of Public Housing units = 17,892	Actual number of Public Housing units = Unk	
	Number of HOHs that list Child Support as an income source = 132	Expected number of HOHs that list Child Support as an income source = 132	Actual number of HOHs that list Child Support as an income source = Unk	
	Average Section 9 Subsidy per Child Support Income Household Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Section 9 Subsidy per Child Support Income Household After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Section 9 Subsidy per Child Support Income Household After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 34,679.91	\$ 34,679.91	TBD	
	section 9 subsidy	section 9 subsidy	section 9 subsidy	

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue = \$2,207,333	Expected PHA rental revenue = \$2,275,601	Actual PHA rental revenue = Unk	Exceeds Benchmark
	Number of Public Housing units = 17,939	Expected number of Public Housing units = 17,983	Actual number of PHA units = Unk	
	PHA Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected PHA Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity	Actual PHA Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 123.05	\$ 126.54	TBD	
	average monthly revenue per public housing unit	average monthly revenue per public housing unit	average monthly revenue per public housing unit	

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>report Child Support Income</u>) Prior to Implementation of the Activity 132 HOHs reporting child support income	Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>report Child Support Income</u>) After Implementation of the Activity 132 HOHs reporting child support income	Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>report Child Support Income</u>) After Implementation of the Activity TBD HOHs reporting child support income	Exceeds Benchmark

G. GIVE THE YEARLY BENCHMARKS FOR EACH METRIC (A NUMERIC VALUE):

Annual Benchmarks						
Unit Measurement	Baseline FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	\$ 7,036.64	\$ 6,421.42	\$ 6,257.61	\$ 6,113.80	\$ 5,951.54	\$ 5,574.33
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	241.6	220.4	208.6	198.0	187.4	175.6
Average error rate in completing task as a percentage (decrease)	5.0%	11.9%	10.5%	9.2%	7.9%	6.6%
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	\$ 15,113.74	\$ 15,113.74	\$ 15,251.14	\$ 15,365.64	\$ 15,462.52	\$ 15,545.57
Percentage of total workable households employed fulltime	8.3%	8.3%	10.6%	12.9%	15.2%	17.4%
Percentage of total workable households employed part time	27.3%	27.3%	28.8%	30.3%	30.3%	31.8%
Percentage of total workable households unemployed	64.4%	64.4%	61.4%	57.6%	55.3%	51.5%
Number of households receiving TANF assistance	37	37	36	35	34	33
Average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease)	\$ 34,679.91	\$ 34,679.91	\$ 32,642.07	\$ 31,252.56	\$ 29,922.82	\$ 28,649.06
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase)	\$ 123.05	\$ 126.54	\$ 127.33	\$ 129.57	\$ 131.94	\$ 134.05
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase)	132	132	134	135	137	139

H. DESCRIBE THE FINAL PROJECTED OUTCOME(S) OF THE MTW ACTIVITY FOR EACH METRIC:

- Please see the table under Item G

I. GIVE THE DATA SOURCE FROM WHICH METRIC DATA WILL BE COMPILED:

HACG will use reports from the agency database to collect metrics data, as well as information collected by Housing Managers during annual and interim examinations at the individual development sites.

J. CITE THE AUTHORIZATION(S) THAT GIVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO CONDUCT THE ACTIVITY:

- C.11 Rent Policies and Term Limits

K. EXPLAIN WHY THE CITED AUTHORIZATION(S) IS NEEDED TO ENGAGE IN THIS ACTIVITY:

Current statutes or regulations require PHAs to use all countable income to calculate a resident's monthly rent. HACG seeks the authorization for "...establishing definitions of income and adjusted income, or earned income disallowance that differ..." in order to examine whether this activity promotes cost effectiveness and/or self-sufficiency.

L. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR RENT REFORM ACTIVITIES:

- Impact Analysis
 - Description
 - Eliminating child support from the income calculation, is intended to promote Cost Effectiveness and Self-Sufficiency by reducing administrative burdens to staff and increasing disposable income to affected households;
 - Tracking and Documentation
 - Housing Managers will track and document households with Child Support Income on Excel spreadsheets and through the agency's database system. Housing Managers will "show" the income and then deduct/exclude the income from the adjusted income total;
 - Intended and Unintended Impacts
 - To reduce the administrative burden placed on housing staff when income is verified, but does not materialize thus putting the income receiving family in a delinquent rent payment status;
 - To increase disposable income for Heads of Household to use within the household;
 - To remove the punitive view of child support and encourage custodial parents to file child support orders on non-custodial parents;
 - May promote a message of "live for free" since child support only households will have their sole-source of income excluded and rent reduced;
 - May trigger an increase of child support claims filed since there would not be a "negative" consequence for having child support compared to the current policy, where child support is calculated;

- Hardship Criteria
 - The HACG does not anticipate any hardships because the rent is being lowered, not raised
- Description of Annual Reevaluation
 - Income source report will be pulled and compared annually to determine if income sources change
- Transition Period
 - The HACG anticipates that residents will be transitioned out of current rent structure and into new rent structure at each annual/interim recertification period

2015.02 - Portability Restrictions

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITY:

HACG proposes to present work requirements on incoming (ports in) and outgoing (ports out) vouchers to learn if there is a Cost Effectiveness to the agency by operating in this business model and if the limitations help clients become more self-sufficient.

Tenant-based vouchers offer recipient families the flexibility to live in different parts of their community, as well as different parts of the country that they may not have had access to without the benefit of rental assistance. The tenant-based voucher flexibility provides families with a sense of autonomy and an ability to blend in a community with limited “labeling” and “stigmas” attached to public housing residents. The tenant-based voucher would also provide the residents with the opportunity to live closer to their jobs, in better school districts, near childcare providers, and so forth, whereas project-based vouchers and public housing developments probably could not and would not have afforded the voucher family the same opportunities.

With this flexibility, tenant-based vouchers place an inordinate amount of time consumption on HACG because staff has to track and account for vouchers porting in/out. Portability reduces the focus on local vouchers, “unaccounted for” administrative time, reconciling, and accounting for tenant-based vouchers outside HACG’s jurisdiction. Tenant-based vouchers must be tracked, PHAs must be billed, and budget authorities must be adhered and met. The flexibility, although wonderful, can wreak havoc on voucher accounting, especially when a PHA is “handcuffed” from helping local families because the number of vouchers and/or budget authority is met. In addition, an element of unfairness is entered from the local perspective, where a PHAs wait list can continually grow, but the PHA is not able to address the wait list due to the number of port ins and outs respectively.

In an effort to address fairness, limit administrative burdens, and ultimately help more families, the HACG seeks to apply a work restriction on port ins and outs. The HACG will not approve any ports out unless it is verifiable employment related and will not “absorb” any ports in unless the Head of Household is employed at least 20 hours per week on average and has been employed for six consecutive months or longer.

However, relocations related to education, health (medical/disability), long-term care, etc..., will be considered on a case-by-case basis. By implementing a work requirement HACG’s financial commitment to the working family may decrease and produce a budget authority savings that the HACG can use to help other families with rental assistance measures are unidentified at this time.

HACG proposes to implement this activity on July 1 for new families porting into and out of HACG’s jurisdiction. Existing families will be “grandfathered” under the traditional portability rules, but new families will be governed under the activity via HACG’s MTW designation:

1. Occupancy Specialists will account for all ports in and ports out under their caseload
2. Occupancy Specialists will ensure port in and port out voucher requests meet the work requirement, which is 6 consecutive employment months for ports in and a verifiable employment offer for ports out

B. DESCRIBE HOW ACTIVITY WILL ACHIEVE (1+) THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES:

HACG believes that applying portability restrictions to tenant-based vouchers and limiting voucher payments to the lower FMR of the two jurisdictions will achieve three Statutory Objectives, 1) Cost Effectiveness, and 2) Expanded Housing Choice:

- This activity will meet the Cost Effectiveness objective because it . . .
 - Allows the HACG to operate more efficiently with its budget authority and voucher assignment, when families choosing to relocate to and from Columbus, GA are employed. The employment virtue increases the family's rent portion and decreases HACG's portion, which allows HACG to leverage the "net savings" to help other families in need of rental assistance.
- This activity will meet the Expanded Housing Choice objective because it . . .
 - Promotes employment, which will provide the family with more options, because the family has more income to apply toward housing. In addition, with the work requirement and lower FMR payment, the HACG is able to leverage those savings to help more families locally than otherwise able to help without the benefit of a work requirement and lower FMR payment.

C. IDENTIFY AND DISCUSS THE ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF ACTIVITY ON STATED OBJECTIVES:

- Anticipated impacts of this activity include:
 - Witness more families designing plans before moving from city-to-city and region-to-region with a limited plan or without a plan
 - Reduction to HACG's budget commitment to localities housing HACG voucher families
 - Increase port in families with stable employment
 - Decrease port out families moving just for a change of scenery
 - Decrease rental assistance because family has increased their household income
 - The ability to increase the number of families HACG is able to help locally
- Alternative impacts of this activity include:
 - Restriction does not prevent families from moving
 - Work requirement does not encourage families to seek and maintain employment
 - The HACG continues billing other PHAs for their ports in to Columbus

D. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULES FOR ACHIEVING THE STATED OBJECTIVES:

- HACG will implement this activity during the fiscal year upon the adoption of the Annual MTW Plan and approval of proposed activity and anticipates the impacts of the activity to begin being realized in HACG's 2016 fiscal year forward

E. STANDARD HUD METRICS THAT HACG ANTICIPATES AS A RESULT OF ACTIVITY:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

<i>CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

<i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:				
(1) Employed Full- Time	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

F. Baseline Performance Level for each Metric (a numeric value) Prior to Implementation of MTW Activity:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Average compensation (salary & benefits) of Occupancy Specialists, Accounts Payable, and Section 8 Coordinator = \$32.77/hour	Expected average compensation of Occupancy Specialists, Accounts Payable, and Section 8 Coordinator = \$32.77/hour	Actual average compensation (salary & benefits) of Occupancy Specialists, Accounts Payable, and Section 8 Coordinator = Unk/hour	No
	Time to manage port clients (63 in; 91 out) = 42 hours per month	Expected time to manage port clients (63 in; 91 out) = 42 hours per month	Actual time to manage port clients (?? in; ?? out) = Unk hours per month	
	Cost of Port Management Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Cost of Port Management After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Cost of Port Management After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 211,956.36 cost to manage portability clients	\$ 211,956.36 cost to manage portability clients	TBD cost to manage portability clients	

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Estimated staff time of Occupancy Specialists, Accounts Payable, and Section 8 Coordinator = 42 hours per month	Expected staff time of Occupancy Specialists, Accounts Payable, and Section 8 Coordinator = 42 hours per month	Actual staff time of Occupancy Specialists, Accounts Payable, and Section 8 Coordinator = Unk hours per month	No
	Number of port clients = 154 (63 in; 91 out)	Expected number of port clients = 154 (63 in; 91 out)	Actual number of port clients = Unk (?? in; ?? out)	
	Total Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Port Clients Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Port Clients After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Port Clients Prior to Implementation of the Activity	
	6,468.0 staff hours	6,468.0 staff hours	TBD staff hours	

CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant revenue received = Unk Number of tenants = Unk Number of portability clients = 154 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity \$ - tenant rental revenue	Expected tenant revenue received = Unk Expected number of tenants = Unk Expected number of portability clients = 154 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity \$ - tenant rental revenue	Actual tenant revenue received = Unk Actual number of tenants = Unk Actual number of portability clients = Unk Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity TBD tenant rental revenue	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Earned income of Section 8 households = Unk Number of Section 8 households = Unk Number of portability households = 154 Average Earned Income of Portability Clients Prior to Implementation of the Activity \$ - average earned income	Expected earned income of Section 8 households = Unk Expected number of Section 8 households = Unk Expected number of portability households = 154 Expected Average Earned Income of Portability Clients After Implementation of the Activity \$ - average earned income	Actual earned income of Section 8 households = Unk Actual number of Section 8 households = Unk Actual number of portability households = Unk Actual Average Earned Income of Portability Clients After Implementation of the Activity TBD average earned income	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:				
(1) Employed Full- Time	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full- Time	Number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Number of work-able households Employed Fulltime = Unk Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime Prior to Implementation of the Activity 0% employed fulltime	Expected number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Expected number of work-able households Employed Fulltime = Unk Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity 0% employed fulltime	Actual number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Actual number of work-able households Employed Fulltime = Unk Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Fulltime After Implementation of the Activity TBD employed fulltime	Exceeds Benchmark
(2) Employed Part- Time	Number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Number of work-able households Employed Part time = Unk Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time Prior to Implementation of the Activity 0% employed part time	Expected number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Expected number of work-able households Employed Part time = Unk Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity 0% employed part time	Actual number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Actual number of work-able households Employed Part time = Unk Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Employed Part Time After Implementation of the Activity TBD employed part time	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - continued

Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
(5) Unemployed	Number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Number of work-able households Unemployed = Unk Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed Prior to Implementation of the Activity 0% unemployed	Expected number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Expected number of work-able households Unemployed = Unk Expected Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity 0% unemployed	Actual number of portability work-able households (19-61) = Unk Actual number of work-able households Unemployed = Unk Actual Percentage of Work-Able Households Unemployed After Implementation of the Activity TBD unemployed	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity TBD households receiving TANF	Expected Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity TBD households receiving TANF	Actual Households Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity TBD households receiving TANF	Meets Benchmark

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase in earned income) among port clients (63 in; 91 out) = Unk Portability Households <u>Reporting Earned Income</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity 0 portability households reporting earned income	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase in earned income) among port clients (63 in; 91 out) = Unk Expected Portability Households <u>Reporting Earned Income</u> After Implementation of the Activity 0 portability households reporting earned income	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase in earned income) among port clients (?? in; ?? out) = Unk Actual Portability Households <u>Reporting Earned Income</u> After Implementation of the Activity 0 portability households reporting earned income	Meets Benchmark

G. GIVE THE YEARLY BENCHMARKS FOR EACH METRIC (A NUMERIC VALUE):

Annual Benchmark						
Unit of Measurement	Baseline FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease)	\$ 211,956.36	\$ 211,956.36	\$ 187,182.24	\$ 187,182.24	\$ 183,053.22	\$ 178,924.20
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease)	6,468.0	6,468.0	5,712.0	5,712.0	5,586.0	5,460.0
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase)	0	0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase)	0	0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total workable households employed fulltime	0%	0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total workable households employed part time	0%	0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total workable households employed unemployed	0%	0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (report an increase in earned income)	0	0	2	3	4	6

H. DESCRIBE THE FINAL PROJECTED OUTCOME(S) OF THE MTW ACTIVITY FOR EACH METRIC:

- Please see the table under Item G

I. GIVE THE DATA SOURCE FROM WHICH METRIC DATA WILL BE COMPILED:

HACG will use reports from the agency's database system to collect metrics data, as well as information collected by Occupancy Specialists during initial, annual, and interim certifications.

J. CITE THE AUTHORIZATION(S) THAT GIVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO CONDUCT THE ACTIVITY:

- D.1.g Operational Policies and Procedures

K. EXPLAIN WHY THE CITED AUTHORIZATION(S) IS NEEDED TO ENGAGE IN THIS ACTIVITY:

Authorization is needed to engage in the activity because HACG wants to establish its own portability policies that differ from the current, standard portability policies and is necessary to implement HACG's Annual MTW Plan.

L. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR RENT REFORM ACTIVITIES:

- This is not a rent reform activity

2015.03 - Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation (Housing Choice Only)

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITY:

HACG understands that clients, property owners, and even staff can become confused over the variations in the utility allowances chart. HACG believes that the simplification of the Housing Choice Utility Allowance Calculation will clear confusion, reduce rent calculation errors, remove administrative burdens, and promote self-sufficiency. Therefore, HACG proposes to examine if there is a Cost Effectiveness to the agency and its clients by simplifying Utility Allowance Payments (UAP) and matching it to the voucher size and not the unit size for families with Housing Choice Vouchers.

Currently, multiple utilities are factored into a Housing Choice Utility Allowance Calculation. These multiple factors can “handcuff” a family’s ability to find shelter quickly because the family is not aware of which utility services are included in their voucher amount and slows the process down from searching to visiting with their Case Manager and calculating another scenario, which may cause the family to miss out on the unit because their voucher amount is based on the number of utilities that are needed to operate the property. These multiple factors and variations confuse landlord partners and clients. An example of the variations and its impact is shown below:

3 BEDROOM	Sample Utility Options*				
	Natural Gas	Mixed Utilities	Mixed Utilities	Electric	Electric
Housing Type		(elec.; gas water heater)	(gas w/electric stove)	(w/heat pump)	(w/electric heat)
Current Multi-Family Utility Allowance	\$ 199.00	\$ 206.00	\$ 205.00	\$ 202.00	\$ 215.00
Current Mobile Home Utility Allowance	200.00	207.00	206.00	203.00	220.00
Current Single Family Utility Allowance	213.00	222.00	219.00	218.00	237.00
<i>New Utility Allowance - Tenant Paid</i>	\$ 223.00	\$ 223.00	\$ 223.00	\$ 223.00	\$ 223.00
Impact on Rent vs. Current Max UA - On Average, Rent is More / (Less)	\$ (10.00)	\$ (1.00)	\$ (4.00)	\$ (5.00)	\$ 14.00

**There are other utility variations and factors that affect the impact of a participant's rent portion*

Consequently, HACG proposes to simplify the Utility Allowance to two options that will let voucher holding families know exactly how much “house” they can afford. The options incorporate all commonly used utilities (e.g. gas, electricity, water) and are in the table below by bedroom size.

The table differentiates between 1) all utility services paid by the tenant and 2) utility services when the landlord provides water (most common utility paid by the landlord):

Monthly Utility Allowance by Bedroom Size	0 BR	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	5 BR
Water, Sewer, Trash Service Paid by Tenant	\$ 131.00	\$ 154.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 223.00	\$ 268.00	\$ 310.00
Water, Sewer, Trash Service Paid by Landlord	\$ 102.00	\$ 117.00	\$ 134.00	\$ 161.00	\$ 189.00	\$ 216.00

**Calculation Source: Tenant Selection Office*

In cases where the landlord pays a portion of the utilities, but not 100% of the utilities, the paid utility will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Rare utility usage, such as propane, coal, and oil, will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

By simplifying the calculation, Occupancy Specialists can look-up the voucher size amount and the UAP and provide the client with a clearer idea of the amount of “house” that they can afford based on the simplified UAP calculation. This simplification proposal reduces rent calculation errors and mid-year adjustments.

Finally, the simplification of the Utility Allowance encourages families to be more conscientious about the amount of “house” that they select because the UAP covers all utilities and provides one amount for the client to use to find housing for the family. Payment simplification prevents clients starting and re-starting their housing search because the numbers did not work initially.

The HACG anticipates that the implementation process will resemble as follows:

1. Occupancy Specialists will present new UAP to clients beginning with October 1, 2014 annual examinations and each annual/interim recertification thereafter

B. DESCRIBE HOW ACTIVITY WILL ACHIEVE (1+) THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES:

HACG believes that by re-calculating the utility assistance that it will meet two of the three statutory objectives; 1) Cost Effectiveness and 2) Self-Sufficiency

- This activity will meet the Cost Effectiveness objective because it . . .
 - Allows the HACG to operate more efficiently under its budget authority and voucher assignment, because the UAP promotes simplification
 - Reduces the time to calculate individual utilities on possibly multiple houses and only pays for the appropriate size unit
 - Reduces rent calculation errors and promotes a “one touch” philosophy that allows Occupancy Specialists to “touch” a file one time and free time to help more clients
- This activity will meet the Self-Sufficiency objective because it . . .
 - Promotes personal responsibility, which is a step toward self-sufficiency
 - Emphasizes the importance of utility consumption and energy efficient housing

- Encourages clients to think and re-think about being more cost conscious about utility consumption

C. IDENTIFY AND DISCUSS THE ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF ACTIVITY ON STATED OBJECTIVES:

- Anticipated impacts of this activity include:
 - Reducing the frustrations of conducting a housing search for Housing Choice families because families are armed with a clearer budget
 - Providing a minimal cost-savings to the HACG
 - Allowing Occupancy Specialists to operate more efficiently and provide more time to spend helping families with their housing needs contrasted with calculating and recalculating Utility Allowance Calculations
- Alternative impacts of this activity include:
 - Simplification of payments overlook uncommon costly utilities or services and may price family out of unit – an example centers on a family finding a charming, historic unit that is heated by an alternate source due to the age of the property. This alternate may be rare, expensive, and not factored into the Utility Allowance Calculation

D. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULES FOR ACHIEVING THE STATED OBJECTIVES:

- HACG will implement this activity during the fiscal year upon the adoption of the Annual MTW Plan and approval of proposed activity and anticipates the impacts of the activity to begin being realized in HACG's 2016 fiscal year forward

E. STANDARD HUD METRICS THAT HACG ANTICIPATES AS A RESULT OF ACTIVITY:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

F. Baseline Performance Level for each Metric (a numeric value) Prior to Implementation of MTW Activity:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Average compensation (salary & benefits) of Occupancy Specialists = \$24.50 per hour	Expected average compensation (salary & benefits) of Occupancy Specialists = \$24.50 per hour	Actual average compensation (salary & benefits) of Occupancy Specialists = Unk per hour	No
	Estimated time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 2.00 hours	Expected estimated time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 2.00 hours	Actual time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = Unk hours	
	Number of voucher holding clients = 2,333	Expected number of voucher holding clients = 2,286	Actual number of voucher holding clients = Unk	
	Cost of Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Cost of Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Cost of Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 114,317.00	\$ 112,030.66	TBD	
	agency costs	agency costs	agency costs	

<i>CE #2: Staff Time Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Estimated staff time dedicated to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 2.00 hours Number of voucher holding clients = 2,333 Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Examinations Prior to Implementation of the Activity 4,666.0 staff hours	Expected staff time dedicated to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = 2.00 hours Expected number of voucher holding clients = 2,286 Expected Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Examinations After Implementation of the Activity 4,572.0 staff hours	Actual staff time dedicated to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations = Unk hours Actual number of voucher holding clients = Unk Actual Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Examinations After Implementation of the Activity TBD staff hours	No

<i>CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Number of Housing Choice Voucher files reviewed = 38 Number of file errors detected = 5 Average Error Rate of Housing Choice Voucher Files Prior to Implementation of the Activity 13.2% average error rate	Expected number of Housing Choice Voucher files reviewed = 47 Expected number of file errors detected = 4 Expected Average Error Rate of Housing Choice Voucher Files After Implementation of the Activity 8.5% average error rate	Actual number of Housing Choice Voucher files reviewed = Unk Actual number of file errors detected = Unk Actual Average Error Rate of Housing Choice Voucher Files After Implementation of the Activity TBD average error rate	No

CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue = \$314,834 Number of tenants = 2,099 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity \$ 149.99 tenant rental revenue	Expected tenant rental revenue = \$324,279 Expected number of tenants = 2,162 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity \$ 149.99 tenant rental revenue	Actual tenant rental revenue = Unk Actual number of tenants = Unk Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity TBD tenant rental revenue	Exceeds Benchmark

G. GIVE THE YEARLY BENCHMARKS FOR EACH METRIC (A NUMERIC VALUE):

Annual Benchmark						
Unit of Measurement	Baseline FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	\$ 114,317.00	\$ 112,030.66	\$ 102,508.05	\$ 98,026.83	\$ 93,545.60	\$ 88,504.22
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	4,666.0	4,572.0	4,184.0	4,001.1	3,818.2	3,612.4
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	13.2%	8.5%	8.5%	6.4%	6.4%	6.4%
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	\$ 149.99	\$ 149.99	\$ 151.55	\$ 153.79	\$ 155.89	\$ 158.23

H. DESCRIBE THE FINAL PROJECTED OUTCOME(S) OF THE MTW ACTIVITY FOR EACH METRIC:

- Please see the table under Item G

I. GIVE THE DATA SOURCE FROM WHICH METRIC DATA WILL BE COMPILED:

HACG will use reports from the agency's database to collect metrics data, as well as information collected by Occupancy Specialists during annual certification examinations.

J. CITE THE AUTHORIZATION(S) THAT GIVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO CONDUCT THE ACTIVITY:

- D.2.a "...adopt and implement any reasonable policy to establish...subsidy levels for tenant-based assistance that differ from...mandated program requirements..."

K. EXPLAIN WHY THE CITED AUTHORIZATION(S) IS NEEDED TO ENGAGE IN THIS ACTIVITY:

Authorization is needed to allow the HACG to simplify its utility allowance, which reasonably falls within the subsidy levels of tenant-based assistance.

L. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR RENT REFORM ACTIVITIES:

- Impact Analysis
 - Description
 - Simplify Utility Allowance Calculation is intended to promote Cost Effectiveness and Self-Sufficiency by reducing administrative burden and increasing residents' personal responsibility;
 - Currently, utility allowance options vary greatly and is predicated on the type of housing, bedroom size, and type of utilities:
 1. A Mobile Home Utility Allowance can vary from \$140 to \$220 for 1 to 3 bedroom units,
 2. A Multi-Family Utility Allowance can vary from \$127 to \$215 for 1 to 3 bedroom units,
 3. A Single-Family Utility Allowance can vary from \$138 to \$237 for 1 to 3 bedroom units,
 - The impact of the utility allowance simplification is as follows:
 1. Regardless of the utility being used in the housing type selected, a tenant will have a "fixed" allowance. Where the tenant is paying for trash, water, and/or sewer services, then the allowance ranges from \$131 to \$310 based on bedroom size,
 2. The "fixed" allowance will "save" a tenant anywhere from \$1 to \$28 depending on the utility options, housing type selected, and number of bedrooms,
 3. In some cases, a tenant may not save any money, and some scenarios may require the tenant to spend anywhere from \$1 to \$23 each month, which again, is based on the utility options, housing type selected, and the number of bedrooms.
 - A sample chart showing the potential impact is located on page 44;

- Tracking and Documentation
 - Occupancy Specialists will track and document the number of households that seek a home and have to return to have their voucher “re-calculated” due to the type of utilities needed to operate the property;
- Intended and Unintended Impacts
 - To reduce the administrative burden placed on housing staff when residents select a unit and have to have their voucher amount re-calculated because of the varying utility differences
 - To simplify and reduce confusion of the Utility Allowance Calculation for landlords, clients, and new employees
 - May encourage energy and water conservation
 - May be instances where client comes across a less modern property that is operated by a costly utility, such as coal, propane, or oil
- Hardship Criteria
 - HACG will address hardships issues on a case-by-case basis, including economic hardship, such as rent increases, or where some utility costs will exceed the calculation due to the nature of the utility needed, for example, oil. Clients affected by this change will have their hardship heard in the appropriate forum
- Description of Annual Reevaluation
 - Utility Allowances are reviewed annually by an independent company. This review will continue for the Simplified Utility Allowance. The calculation portion will be reviewed annually to ensure calculations are having the effect intended
- Transition Period
 - The HACG anticipates that residents will be transitioned out of current rent structure and into new rent structure at each annual examination period

2015.04 - Cap Childcare Deductions

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITY:

Childcare is an essential service for many Americans that are employed – part time, fulltime, or self-employed. In addition to this necessity, childcare is an expensive outlay for these same Americans. With this in mind, HACG understands that the proposition is an even grander task to meet for low-income families. HACG wants to learn if a Cap on Childcare Deductions will provide a Cost Effectiveness to the agency and curb clients and residents from submitting exorbitant childcare expenses.

HACG proposes to set cap limits for childcare deductions because the deduction lowers a family's Annual Income and in effect their rent and the cap will help Housing Managers and Occupancy Specialists be more efficient and effective with their examination duties.

The cap is the maximum amount of expenses that HACG will allow and does not relieve families from providing proof of unreimbursed childcare, in fact, HACG realizes that many families pay for childcare service in some form and also understands that some families submit an exorbitant amount of childcare expenses in direct relation to their income in order to reduce their Annual Income and therefore the monthly rent commitment. In general, these families usually have a family member certify that the Head of Household is paying X dollars to them for childcare services; however, the childcare payment to annual income ratio is not in proportion to support the certification.

With this knowledge, HACG wants to implement a cap to promote efficiency with its staff and fairness with its clients and residents, so HACG proposes closely mirroring the local Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS) Children and Parents Services (CAPs) Program reimbursement guidelines. HACG plans to honor properly submitted childcare expenditures up to the limit set for various categories. Cap limits apply to all children up to age 13 (12 and younger) unless the child has a disability and a care provider is needed for the Head of Household to remain employed or engaged in self-sufficiency activities. In these instances, Heads of Household that have children 13 years old and older that require a care provider will have their cases evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

HACG's version of DFACS' CAPs Program reimbursement guideline is tabled on the next page and in the interest of simplicity and to provide a general guideline, HACG uses the terms licensed and unlicensed to distinguish between care facilities such as Day Care Centers and Group Home Care, which fall under License, and Family Member Care and Summer Camps, which fall under Unlicensed.

Tabled below is the initial reimbursement proposal:

Example - HACG Childcare Deductions Cap - Example					
Category		Formal Care	Informal Care	Annual Cap Limit	
		Licensed	Unlicensed	Licensed	Unlicensed
Full Time Care (Per Week) (Care for 3+ days per week)	Infants (Newborn to 12 months)	\$ 87.00	\$ 61.00	\$4,350.00	\$3,050.00
	Toddlers (12+ to 36 months)	\$ 81.50	\$ 60.00	\$4,075.00	\$3,000.00
	Pre-School (>36 mos to 5 years)	\$ 79.00	\$ 58.00	\$3,950.00	\$2,900.00
	School Age (6 years and up)	\$ 79.00	\$ 60.00	\$3,950.00	\$3,000.00
Part Time Care (Per Day) (Care for 1 or 2 days per week)	Any Age Allowed in CAPs	\$ 24.00	\$ 20.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,000.00
Before and After School Care (Per Week) (Includes Pre-K, Head Start or Kindergarten Wrap-Around, and for Ages 6 thru 12)		\$ 54.00	\$ 50.00	\$2,700.00	\$2,500.00

Category Source: Muscogee County DFACS CAPs Manual

HACG simplified the amounts due to the variations in amounts (see appendix), HACG plans to revisit the amount periodically to ensure the activity is having the intended effect for both HACG and client/residents.

The childcare deductions will be based on the following:

- Children properly added to the HACG Lease Agreement
- Childcare properly verified with a local childcare service provider
- Childcare properly verified by a family member

Families not meeting the above listed criteria will not receive a childcare deduction until each criterion is met.

This activity will allow Housing Managers and Occupancy Specialists to move quickly through this portion of the interview, because if the amount exceeds the cap, staff simply enters the maximum amount and there is no additional time spent verifying or seeking a manager's "override" of the amount submitted. Thusly, staff are empowered and able to help more residents needing to have an examination completed or needing housing. Further, this activity will increase the accuracy of rent calculations and reduce the need for "corrections" to the childcare deductions line-item.

Note, families must still produce evidence that they have accrued childcare expenses during the year in order to receive the childcare deduction.

B. DESCRIBE HOW ACTIVITY WILL ACHIEVE (1+) THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES:

By placing a limit/cap on Childcare Deductions, the HACG believes that it will meet one of the three statutory objectives: Cost Effectiveness

- This activity will meet the Cost Effectiveness objective because it . . .
 - Allows the HACG to operate more efficiently when conducting its Annual and Interim Examinations;
 - Reduces rent calculation errors because the childcare deductions will be standardized and applied across the board. There are less varying amounts in which to calculate and throw off the calculations;
 - Generates more revenue for the HACG because exorbitant childcare claims, which reduces the family's household income are limited and minimized to DFACS' CAPs Program

C. IDENTIFY AND DISCUSS THE ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF ACTIVITY ON STATED OBJECTIVES:

- Anticipated impacts of this activity include:
 - More families properly listing children on their lease
 - The reduction of family member childcare statements in order to reduce Annual Income to lower the family's rent portion
 - Allow Housing Managers and Occupancy Specialists to operate more efficiently and provide more time to spend helping families with their housing needs
 - Provide a minimal cost-savings to the HACG
 - Increase a minimal amount of revenue for the HACG
- Alternative impacts of this activity include:
 - Residents complain about the "loss" of childcare deduction if the standard amount is lower than their actual payment
 - Standardization does not allow Housing Managers and Occupancy Specialists to focus on housing, but has them focusing more on explaining the standard deduction
 - Residents not using the childcare deduction complain that they did not know and want retroactive compensation for years of not claiming the deduction.

D. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULES FOR ACHIEVING THE STATED OBJECTIVES:

- HACG will implement this activity during the fiscal year or next recertification period upon the adoption of the Annual MTW Plan and approval of proposed activity and anticipates the impacts of the activity to begin being realized in HACG's 2016 fiscal year forward

E. STANDARD HUD METRICS THAT HACG ANTICIPATES AS A RESULT OF ACTIVITY:

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

F. Baseline Performance Level for each Metric (a numeric value) Prior to Implementation of MTW Activity:

<i>CE #1: Agency Cost Savings</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Average compensation (salary & benefits) of Housing Managers = \$29.13; Occupancy Specialists = \$24.50 per hour	Expected average compensation (salary & benefits) of Housing Managers = \$29.13; Occupancy Specialists = \$24.50 per hour	Actual compensation (salary & benefits) of Housing Managers = Unk; Occupancy Specialists = Unk per hour	No
	Estimated time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations for Public Housing = 1.83; Housing Choice Vouchers = 2.00 hours	Expected time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations for Public Housing = 1.83; Housing Choice Vouchers = 2.00 hours	Actual time to conduct annual/interim recertification examinations for Public Housing = Unk; Housing Choice Vouchers = Unk hours	
	Number of Public Housing units = 1,717; Housing Choice Voucher units = 2,333	Expected number of Public Housing units = 1,683; Housing Choice Voucher units = 2,286	Actual number of Public Housing units = Unk; Housing Choice Voucher units = Unk	
	Cost of Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Cost of Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Cost of Annual/Interim Recertification Examinations After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 102,923.33	\$ 100,865.60	TBD	
	agency cost	agency cost	agency cost	

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	<p>Estimated staff time dedicated to conduct Public Housing annual/interim recertification examinations = 1.83; Housing Choice Vouchers = 2.00 hours</p> <p>Number of Public Housing units = 1,717; Housing Choice Voucher units = 2,333</p> <p>Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Examinations Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>3,904.1</p> <p>staff hours</p>	<p>Expected staff time dedicated to conduct Public Housing annual/interim recertification examinations = 1.83; Housing Choice Vouchers = 2.00 hours</p> <p>Expected number of Public Housing units = 1,683; Housing Choice Voucher units = 2,286</p> <p>Expected Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Examinations After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>3,825.9</p> <p>staff hours</p>	<p>Actual staff time dedicated to conduct Public Housing annual/interim recertification examinations = Unk; Housing Choice Vouchers = Unk hours</p> <p>Expected number of Public Housing units = Unk; Housing Choice Voucher units = Unk</p> <p>Actual Amount of Staff Time Dedicated to Annual/Interim Examinations After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>staff hours</p>	No

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	<p>Number of Public Housing files reviewed = 40; Housing Choice Voucher = 38</p> <p>Number of Public Housing file errors detected = 19; Housing Choice Voucher errors = 5</p> <p>Average Error Rate of Housing Choice Voucher Files Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>30.3%</p> <p>average error rate</p>	<p>Expected number of Public Housing files reviewed = 76; Housing Choice Voucher = 64</p> <p>Expected number of Public Housing file errors detected = 14; Housing Choice Voucher errors = 9</p> <p>Expected Average Error Rate of Housing Choice Voucher Files After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>16.3%</p> <p>average error rate</p>	<p>Actual number of Public Housing files reviewed = Unk; Housing Choice Voucher = Unk</p> <p>Actual number of Public Housing file errors detected = Unk; Housing Choice Voucher errors = Unk</p> <p>Actual Average Error Rate of Housing Choice Voucher Files After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>average error rate</p>	No

CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue for Public Housing = \$2,249,908; Housing Choice Voucher = \$314,834 Number of Public Housing units = 17,958; Housing Choice Voucher = 2,099 Tenant Rental Revenue Prior to Implementation of the Activity \$ 137.64 average tenant monthly rent share	Expected tenant rental revenue for Public Housing = \$2,249,908; Housing Choice Voucher = \$324,279 Expected number of Public Housing units = 17,958; Housing Choice Voucher = 2,162 Expected Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity \$ 137.64 average tenant monthly rent share	Actual tenant rental revenue for Public Housing = Unk; Housing Choice Voucher = Unk Actual number of Public Housing units = Unk; Housing Choice Voucher = Unk Actual Tenant Rental Revenue After Implementation of the Activity TBD average tenant monthly rent share	Exceeds Benchmark

G. GIVE THE YEARLY BENCHMARKS FOR EACH METRIC (A NUMERIC VALUE):

Annual Benchmark						
Unit of Measurement	Baseline FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	\$ 102,923.33	\$ 100,865.60	\$ 92,182.94	\$ 87,736.50	\$ 83,535.19	\$ 81,014.87
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	3,904.1	3,825.9	3,497.0	3,329.8	3,171.1	3,068.2
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	30.3%	16.3%	14.9%	13.4%	12.0%	10.5%
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	\$ 137.64	\$ 137.64	\$ 138.57	\$ 140.21	\$ 140.21	\$ 144.42

H. DESCRIBE THE FINAL PROJECTED OUTCOME(S) OF THE MTW ACTIVITY FOR EACH METRIC:

- Please see the table under Item G

I. GIVE THE DATA SOURCE FROM WHICH METRIC DATA WILL BE COMPILED:

HACG will use reports from the agency's database system to collect metrics data, as well as information collected by Housing Managers and Occupancy Specialists during annual and interim certification examinations.

J. CITE THE AUTHORIZATION(S) THAT GIVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO CONDUCT THE ACTIVITY:

- C.11 Rent Policies and Term Limits
- D.2.a Rent Policies and Term Limits

K. EXPLAIN WHY THE CITED AUTHORIZATION(S) IS NEEDED TO ENGAGE IN THIS ACTIVITY:

The authorizations are needed because the HACG wants to "...adopt and implement any reasonable policies for setting rents...establishing definitions of income and adjusted income...that differ from those in current statutes or regulations..." in order to cap the childcare deduction component of the tenant rent calculation

L. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR RENT REFORM ACTIVITIES:

- Impact Analysis
 - Description
 - The activity, Cap Childcare Deductions, is intended to promote Cost Effectiveness by the reducing administrative burden and reducing the rent calculation errors;
 - Tracking and Documentation
 - Housing Managers, Occupancy Specialists, and housing partners will track and document the number of households that seek a childcare deduction greater than the imposed cap limit;
 - Intended and Unintended Impacts
 - To reduce the number of childcare verifications by family members that reflect an unusually large childcare expense in an effort to possibly reduce their Annual Income and effect a reduction in rent;
 - To simplify and standardized childcare deductions and reduce rent calculation errors;
 - May be instances where residents and clients find a way to max childcare deductions and reduce HACG's potential revenue stream generated from income;

- Hardship Criteria
 - HACG will address hardships issues on a case-by-case basis, including economic hardship, such as rent increases, or where some childcare costs will exceed the cap due to the nature of the childcare needed, for example, special needs child. Residents and clients affected by this change will have their hardship heard in the appropriate forum;
- Description of Annual Reevaluation
 - Childcare Deduction will be reviewed annually to remain consistently close to the DFACS CAPs Program reimbursement guidelines. The calculation portion will be reviewed annually as well to ensure the deduction is being calculated as intended;
- Transition Period
 - The HACG anticipates that residents will be transitioned out of current rent structure and into new rent structure at each annual examination period.

2015.05 - Rapid Re-Housing Vouchers (formerly Emergency, Temporary Housing / Rapid Re-Housing Vouchers) – Incorporated into Activity 2014.02 – Innovations to Reduce Homelessness (see page 78)

2014.01 - Community Choice

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED MTW ACTIVITY:

This activity was approved in HACG's 2014 Annual MTW Plan and seeks to introduce low-income families to low-poverty areas and compare the outcomes with a control group. Due to the significant changes to the initial activity proposed by HACG in its initial plan, this is a revision of that activity. The original activity sought to randomly select volunteer families to follow in one of the three categories: 120% voucher community-wide, 120% voucher in a low-poverty area, and control group.

The activity was to be phased in over two years and was approved by HUD as follows:

- 20 tenant-based vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent (FMR) in FY 2014
- 20 project-based vouchers at 120% of the FMR at a market rate property in a low to very low-poverty area of the city in FY 2014
- 20 tenant-based vouchers under the normal HCV guidelines to serve as the control group in FY 2014
- 20 tenant-based vouchers at 120% of the FMR in FY 2015
- 20 project-based vouchers at a market rate property in a low to very low-poverty area of the city at 120% of the FMR in FY 2015
- 20 tenant-based vouchers under the normal HCV guidelines to serve as the control group in FY 2015

The activity's implementation delay is attributed to the following factors:

- The Sub-Grantee Agreement with the activity's evaluator, Columbus State University's (CSU) Social Research Center, was not approved until December 2013, for a January 1, 2014 start date;
 - This delay precluded HACG's Tenant Selection Office from offering 20 vouchers at 120% of the local FMR;
- HACG's Request for Proposal (RFP) to project-base 20 vouchers at 120% of the local FMR at a private market property in a low to very low-poverty area of the city was met with no favorable responses;
 - The lack of responses prevented HACG from assigning 20 project-based vouchers at 120% of the local FMR in a low- or a very low-poverty area;
- The lack of an evaluator and a private market partner prevented HACG from recruiting control and test groups, as the evaluator suggested all actions should take place as close to one another as possible

Consequently, HACG has re-tooled the activity and plans the following changes, which are bolded in **red**:

- **40** tenant-based vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent in FY 2015
- **40** tenant-based vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent **restricted to census tracts** with a low concentration of poverty
- 40 tenant-based vouchers under the normal HCV guidelines to serve as the control group in FY 2015

The major changes in the activity involve condensing the phase in approach to immediate implementation and changing the project-base voucher portion to restricted tenant-base vouchers. The latter change will require those families to reside in a low-poverty census tract as identified by the HACG.

The current payment standard for HACG is 90% of the Fair Market Rent (FMR). The current FMR and the proposed 120% payment standard are shown below by bedroom size:

Bedroom Size	2014 FMR*	120% of FMR
0	\$ 508	\$ 610
1	\$ 595	\$ 714
2	\$ 705	\$ 846
3	\$ 971	\$ 1,165
4	\$ 1,249	\$ 1,499

*FMR effective October 2013; source: <http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/fmr.html>

The current average Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) is \$496.00 per unit. Presuming that all 80 residents take advantage of the 120% voucher payment, the average HAP will increase \$3.00 from \$496.00 to \$499.00 per unit. All rents will be subject to a rent reasonableness determination.

The table below shows anticipated monthly costs:

Number of Vouchers	Per Unit Cost	Monthly HAP Total
2,253	\$ 496	\$1,117,488
80	\$ 595	\$ 47,616
2,333	\$ 499	\$1,165,104

The 40 Community Choice vouchers plus the 40 Low-Poverty Restriction vouchers per unit cost increases \$99.00 above the average standard voucher cost. This equals an annual increase in HAP:

Number of 120% Vouchers	Per Unit Cost Increase	Annual HAP Total
80	\$ 99	\$ 95,040

The activity continues to examine if families will take advantage of the ability to live in low-poverty areas and if this will impact the families positively in the form of education, socialization, fiscal responsibility, health, and other areas of their life.

B. DESCRIBE HOW ACTIVITY WILL ACHIEVE (1+) THE STATUTORY OBJECTIVES:

By providing vouchers 20% above the Fair Market Rent, the HACG believes it will meet one of the three statutory objectives; 1) Expanded Housing Choice

- This activity will meet the Expanded Housing Choice objective because it . . .
 - Allows families to live in other areas of the city that they normally would not consider living in due to the rental cost and or stigma associated with living on the “other side of the tracks”
 - Allows families access to other school districts and similar amenities that may not have been available to them with a traditional voucher amount

C. IDENTIFY AND DISCUSS THE ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF ACTIVITY ON STATED OBJECTIVES:

- Anticipated impacts of this activity include:
 - Opportunity for the family to gain housing self-sufficiency more quickly
 - Expanded housing choice and to allow the family to live in low-poverty areas
- Alternative impacts of this activity include:
 - Family counts on 20% increased voucher and becomes dependent on subsidy
 - Family refuses to participate in assessments and evaluations with CSU’s Social Research Center
 - Family moves without notifying CSU’s Social Research Center
 - Family’s financial position worsens due to the feeling that they must portray an image by living on the “other side of the tracks”
 - Per Unit Costs decrease and prevents the HACG from providing the 20% increase subsidy

D. ANTICIPATED SCHEDULES FOR ACHIEVING THE STATED OBJECTIVES:

- HACG will implement this activity during the fiscal year upon the adoption of the Annual MTW Plan and approval of proposed activity and anticipates the impacts of the activity to begin being realized in HACG's 2017 fiscal year forward

E. STANDARD HUD METRICS THAT HACG ANTICIPATES AS A RESULT OF ACTIVITY:

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full- Time				
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

F. Baseline Performance Level for each Metric (a numeric value) Prior to Implementation of MTW Activity:

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Community-Wide Group - Vouchers are 120% of Fair Market Rent (FMR)	Earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Number of households affected by this policy = Unk	Expected earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Expected number of households affected by this policy = 40	Actual earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Actual number of households affected by this policy = Unk	Meets Benchmark
	Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity	
	TBD average earned income	TBD average earned income	TBD average earned income	
Restricted Group - Vouchers are 120% of FMR & Restricted to Low Poverty Area	Earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Number of households affected by this policy = Unk	Expected earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Expected number of households affected by this policy = 40	Actual earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Actual number of households affected by this policy = Unk	Meets Benchmark
	Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity	
	TBD average earned income	TBD average earned income	TBD average earned income	

<i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income - continued</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Control Group - Vouchers are Issued in Accordance with Payment Standards	Earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Number of households affected by this policy = Unk	Expected earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Expected number of households affected by this policy = 40	Actual earned income of households affected by this policy = Unk Actual number of households affected by this policy = Unk	Meets Benchmark
	Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Average Earned Income of Households Affected by this Policy After Implementation of the Activity	
	TBD average earned income	TBD average earned income	TBD average earned income	

<i>SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</i>				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full- Time				
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Community-Wide

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
(1) Employed Full- Time	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	Exceeds Benchmark
(2) Employed Part- Time	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	Exceeds Benchmark
(5) Unemployed	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the community-wide group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Community-Wide Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Restricted Vouchers

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
(1) Employed Full- Time	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	Exceeds Benchmark
(2) Employed Part- Time	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	Exceeds Benchmark
(5) Unemployed	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the restricted group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Restricted Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	Exceeds Benchmark

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status - Control Group

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
(1) Employed Full- Time	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Fulltime in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Employed Fulltime</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">employed fulltime</p>	Exceeds Benchmark
(2) Employed Part- Time	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Employed Part Time in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Employed Part Time</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">employed part time</p>	Exceeds Benchmark
(5) Unemployed	<p>Number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> Prior to Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	<p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = 40;</p> <p>Expected number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Expected Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">0.0%</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	<p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual number of work-able (19-61) households Unemployed in the control group = Unk;</p> <p>Actual Percentage of Control Work-Able Households <u>Unemployed</u> After Implementation of the Activity</p> <p align="center">TBD</p> <p align="center">unemployed</p>	Exceeds Benchmark

<i>SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of community-wide households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Number of Households in the Community-Wide Group Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity TBD community-wide HOHs receiving TANF	Expected Number of Households in the Community-Wide Group Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity 0 community-wide HOHs receiving TANF	Actual Number of Households in the Community-Wide Group Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity TBD community-wide HOHs receiving TANF	No
Number of restricted households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Number of Households in the Restricted Group Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity TBD restricted voucher HOHs receiving TANF	Expected Number of Households in the Restricted Group Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity 0 restricted voucher HOHs receiving TANF	Actual Number of Households in the Restricted Group Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity TBD restricted voucher HOHs receiving TANF	No
Number of control group households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Number of Households in the Control Group Receiving TANF Prior to Implementation of the Activity TBD control group HOHs receiving TANF	Expected Number of Households in the Control Group Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity 0 control group HOHs receiving TANF	Actual Number of Households in the Control Group Receiving TANF After Implementation of the Activity TBD control group HOHs receiving TANF	No

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per community wide household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = \$8,762,268	Expected Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = \$13,143,402	Actual Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = Unk	No
	Number of Housing Choice Units = 18,664	Expected Number of Housing Choice Units = 27,996	Actual number of Housing Choice Units = Unk	
	Number of community-wide vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = 40	Expected Number of community-wide vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = 40	Actual number of community-wide vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = Unk	
	Average Subsidy per Community-Wide Household Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Average Subsidy per Community-Wide Household After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Average Subsidy per Community-Wide Household After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 18,778.97	\$ 18,778.97	TBD	
	section 8 subsidy for community-wide group	section 8 subsidy for community-wide group	section 8 subsidy for community-wide group	

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households - continued

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per restricted household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = \$8,762,268	Expected Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = \$13,143,402	Actual Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = Unk	No
	Number of Housing Choice Units = 18,664	Expected Number of Housing Choice Units = 27,996	Actual number of Housing Choice Units = Unk	
	Number of restricted vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = 40	Expected Number of restricted vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = 40	Actual number of restricted vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = Unk	
	Average Subsidy per Restricted Household Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Average Subsidy per Restricted Household After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Average Subsidy per Restricted Household After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 18,778.97	\$ 18,778.97	TBD	
	section 8 subsidy for restricted voucher group	section 8 subsidy for restricted voucher group	section 8 subsidy for restricted voucher group	
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per control group household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = \$8,762,268	Expected Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = \$13,143,402	Actual Housing Choice Voucher subsidy = Unk	No
	Number of Housing Choice Units = 18,664	Expected Number of Housing Choice Units = 27,996	Actual number of Housing Choice Units = Unk	
	Number of control vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = 40	Expected Number of control vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = 40	Actual number of control vouchers at 120% of the Fair Market Rent = Unk	
	Average Subsidy per Control Household Prior to Implementation of the Activity	Expected Average Subsidy per Control Household After Implementation of the Activity	Actual Average Subsidy per Control Household After Implementation of the Activity	
	\$ 18,778.97	\$ 18,778.97	TBD	
	section 8 subsidy for control group	section 8 subsidy for control group	section 8 subsidy for control group	

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of community-wide households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) Prior to Implementation of the Activity 0 self-sufficient community-wide households	Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) After Implementation of the Activity 1 self-sufficient community-wide households	Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) After Implementation of the Activity TBD self-sufficient community-wide households	Exceeds Benchmark
Number of restricted households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) Prior to Implementation of the Activity 0 self-sufficient restricted households	Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) After Implementation of the Activity 1 self-sufficient restricted households	Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) After Implementation of the Activity TBD self-sufficient restricted households	Exceeds Benchmark
Number of control households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) Prior to Implementation of the Activity 0 self-sufficient restricted households	Expected Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) After Implementation of the Activity 1 self-sufficient restricted households	Actual Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency (<u>Maintain Stable Housing for 12+ Consecutive Months</u>) After Implementation of the Activity TBD self-sufficient restricted households	Exceeds Benchmark

G. GIVE THE YEARLY BENCHMARKS FOR EACH METRIC (A NUMERIC VALUE):

Annual Benchmark						
Unit of Measurement	Baseline FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Average earned income of community-wide households in dollars (increase).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Average earned income of restricted households in dollars (increase).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Average earned income of control group households in dollars (increase).	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total community-wide work-able households Employed Fulltime prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total community-wide work-able households Employed Part Time prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total community-wide work-able households Unemployed prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total restricted work-able households Employed Fulltime prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total restricted work-able households Employed Part Time prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total restricted work-able households Unemployed prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Annual Benchmark - continued						
Percentage of total control group work-able households Employed Fulltime prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total control group work-able households Employed Part Time prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of total control group work-able households Unemployed prior to implementation of activity	0.0%	0.0%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of community-wide households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	TBD	0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of restricted households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	TBD	0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of control group households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	TBD	0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per community wide household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	\$ 18,778.97	\$ 18,778.97	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per restricted household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	\$ 18,778.97	\$ 18,778.97	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Average amount of Section 8 subsidy per control group household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	\$ 18,778.97	\$ 18,778.97	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of community-wide households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	0	1	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of restricted households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	0	1	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of control households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase).	0	1	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

H. DESCRIBE THE FINAL PROJECTED OUTCOME(S) OF THE MTW ACTIVITY FOR EACH METRIC:

- Please see the table under Item G

I. GIVE THE DATA SOURCE FROM WHICH METRIC DATA WILL BE COMPILED:

HACG will use reports from the evaluator, CSU's Social Research Center, the agency's database system, and information collected by Occupancy Specialists to collect metrics data.

J. CITE THE AUTHORIZATION(S) THAT GIVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO CONDUCT THE ACTIVITY:

- D.2.a. Rent Policies and Term Limits
- D.2.b. Rent Policies and Term Limits

K. EXPLAIN WHY THE CITED AUTHORIZATION(S) IS NEEDED TO ENGAGE IN THIS ACTIVITY:

In order for the HACG to provide vouchers above the current payment standards, the HACG requests authorizations "...to adopt and implement any reasonable policy to establish payment standards, rents or subsidy levels for tenant-based assistance that differ from the currently mandated program requirements...", as well as the need "...to adopt and implement any reasonable policies to calculate the tenant portion of the rent that differ from the currently mandated program requirements..."

In addition, the HACG wants to be able to "...determine contract rents and increases and to determine the content of contractual rental agreements that differ from the currently mandated program requirements..."

L. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR RENT REFORM ACTIVITIES:

- This is not a rent reform activity

IV. ON-GOING MTW ACTIVITIES: HUD APPROVAL GRANTED

A. IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES:

2014.02 – Innovations to Reduce Homelessness

Activity intends to create a program with up to 150 vouchers that link permanent housing to supportive services for homeless families, with a special emphasis on military veterans, where newly employed military veteran residents will have a tiered rent calculation. This tiered rent system is designed to allow newly employed veterans to benefit from gainful employment and become more stable before having to pay 30% of their income for rent. The tiered rent calculation is proposed as follows over a 5 year period:

- 26% calculation during year 1
- 27% calculation during year 2
- 28% calculation during year 3
- 29% calculation during year 4
- 30% calculation during year 5

The 2015 Annual MTW Plan sets aside up to 50 vouchers to continue the rapid rehousing program initiated in the 2014 Annual MTW Plan. HACG is able to expand the 2014.02 activity due to the partnership established with the State of Georgia's Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities (DBHDD), where HACG will only serve in a referral capacity regarding needs for temporary housing. This partnership allows HACG to focus its attention on assisting and tracking clients referred through the Home for Good (HfG) network on longer term housing terms.

Based on the success of the activity's first year and projected success hereafter, HACG will investigate the use of rapid rehousing vouchers as a potential alternative to developing a "Willow Glen III" facility as proposed in its long-term plans (2018).

The Innovations to Reduce Homelessness Activity anticipates the following for FY2015:

- No non-significant changes to this activity; however, DBHDD is prepared to make 100 Georgia Housing Vouchers available to chronically homeless and Severe and Persistent Mental Illness (SPMI) candidates for a minimum of 120 days. This partnership addresses a proposed temporary premise where HACG will refer clients, it also allows HACG to focus on expanding its rapid rehousing efforts and investigate whether the rapid rehousing of this activity can replace a future permanent supportive housing development that HACG is proposing in its long-term plans. Any changes will be discussed in future Annual MTW Plans.
- No modifications to the metrics at this time
- No different authorizations are needed to implement this activity than originally proposed
- No significant changes to this activity

Standard Metrics

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount of funds leveraged in dollars (increase).	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:				
(1) Employed Full- Time	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

2014.04 – Administrative Efficiencies

Activity seeks to improve operational efficiencies and reduce operational costs by having triennial re-certifications for elderly/disabled families where the head of household (HOH) has a fixed, stable income stream. The approved activity's highlights are as follows:

- Heads of household of elderly/disabled family with fixed, stable income such as Social Security (SS), Social Security Disability (SSD), Social Security Insurance (SSI), and similar fixed payments will have an annual examination every three years;
 - HACG staff spends a considerable amount of time and material costs to recertify elderly/disabled families with fixed, stable income, which result in minimal changes in the family's rent;
 - Elderly/disabled families with an earned income source, whether from the HOH, spouse, or dependents will continue to have annual re-certifications;
- Form 9886, any other relevant forms with an expiration date of less than 3 years, and local forms were presented to HUD for evaluation and modification

The Administrative Efficiencies Activity anticipates the following for FY2015:

- No non-significant changes to this activity
- No modifications to the metrics at this time
- No different authorizations are needed to implement this activity than originally proposed
- No significant changes to this activity

Standard Metrics

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

2014.05 – Streamlined HQS Inspections

Activity seeks to streamline its Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspections to attain a cost effectiveness and savings by inspecting properties that pass either the initial inspection or the first re-inspection every two years. Properties that fail after the first re-inspection are put on the annual inspection list. The approved activity's highlights are as follows:

- Although some units may not be inspected every year, all units must meet HQS at all times while under contract;
- Quality control inspections will still continue;
- Properties that do not pass the first re-inspection, will be considered “at risk” and will not qualify for the every other year inspection procedure (they may once they meet the criteria);
- A \$45.00 fee will be charged to property owner for the second re-inspection and each re-inspection thereafter;
- \$45.00 fee cannot and should not be passed to the HCV family;
- Initiate a self-certification form for both the resident and property owner to complete in cases for correction of minor fail items for properties with an excellent HQS performance record;

The Administrative Efficiencies Activity anticipates the following for FY2015:

- No non-significant changes to this activity
- No modifications to the metrics at this time
- No different authorizations are needed to implement this activity than originally proposed
- No significant changes to this activity

Standard Metrics

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

2014.06 – Rent Reform

Activity studies whether an increase in minimum rent (and consequently, a reduction in Utility Assistance checks), reduced rent calculation, and an introduction of “newly employed perks” will incentivize families to seek and maintain employment and compare the target site to a control site. The approved activity’s highlights are as follows:

- Sites compared are Farley (target site) and Chase (control site);
 - Increase minimum rent (at Farley only) from \$50.00 to \$100.00 per month (phase approach);
 - Increase monthly rent from \$50.00 to \$75.00 in FY2014;
 - Increase monthly rent from \$75.00 to \$100.00 in FY 2015;
- Provide a tiered rent calculation for newly, identified employed Farley residents, where the calculation is designed to allow residents to benefit from their newly gained employment rather than feel as though they are being penalized for gaining employment. The rent calculation will span over five years and adjust annually back the to normal 30% calculation. The tier is as follows:
 - 26% calculation during year 1

- 27% calculation during year 2
- 28% calculation during year 3
- 29% calculation during year 4
- 30% calculation during year 5
- Incentives include a variety of FSS and ROSS initiatives, as well as monetary initiatives for newly employed families;
 - Incentives will be introduced over the course of the demonstration;

The Rent Reform Activity anticipates the following for FY2015:

- No non-significant changes to this activity
- No modifications to the metrics at this time
- No different authorizations are needed to implement this activity than originally proposed
- No significant changes to this activity

Standard Metrics

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:				
(1) Employed Full- Time	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(2) Employed Part- Time				
(3) Enrolled in an Educational Program				
(4) Enrolled in Job Training Program				
(5) Unemployed				
(6) Other				
	Percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of activity (percent). This number may be zero.	Expected percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Actual percentage of total work-able households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (percent).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

B. NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES:

2014.01 – Community Choice

Details of this activity are found in Section III, page 62.

2014.03 – Administrative Reforms

Description:

The Administrative Reforms Activity was approved in the HACG's initial MTW Year, FY 2014 and aims to improve operational efficiencies and reduce operational costs by having new admissions and existing residents self-certify and to eliminate the 40% of income cap to eliminate the possibility of a "rent burden". The approved activity's highlights are as follows:

- Allow Households to self-certify that their assets are below \$50,000;

- Households will be verified by third-party verification or at time of admission to provide the baseline for housing managers and occupancy specialists to use in future years;
- Exclude income from assets that are below \$50,000;
 - Households will be randomly verified by third-party verification after the initial verification sets the baseline to ensure that assets have not exceeded the \$50,000 limit;
- Eliminate the 40% of income cap in the voucher program, where HUD caps a resident's income spent on rent at 40%;
 - This action allows a resident rent to exceed the 40% cap;
 - This action does not permit a "rent burden" on the resident, under no circumstances will the resident's portion of rent be allowed to exceed 50% of their income;
 - New program families are transitioned immediately and existing program families are transitioned during their annual examination

This activity's implementation delay is attributed to the following factors:

- The HACG sent locally created forms to the local field office for approval
- Local field office did not take action on the forms, although requests were made for guidance
- Local field office sent locally created forms to HUD's Washington, D.C. office for approval
- HUD Office in Washington, D.C. approved forms

Implementation Update:

- The HACG has received an email approving the locally created forms and initiated the start of the activity in early 2014 (FY14)

Implementation Timeline:

- March 1 - 31, 2014 – Review initial, annual, and interim certification examinations since July 1, 2014 to capture clients and residents that did not sign the form
- April 1, 2014 – Implement form for all initial, annual, and interim certification examinations forward

Non-Significant Changes:

There are no changes to this activity

Standard Metrics

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average error rate in completing a task as a percentage (decrease).	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity (percentage).	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Actual average error rate of task after implementation of the activity (percentage).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

CE #5: Increase in Tenant Rent Share				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Tenant rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Tenant rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual tenant rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.

C. ACTIVITIES ON HOLD:

There are no activities on hold at this time.

D. CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES:

There are no closed activities at this time.

V. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

HACG's FY 2015 annual budget was presented to the Board of Commissioners for adoption at the April 2014 Board meeting.

A. MTW Plan: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds		
Estimated Sources of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year		
PHAs shall provide the estimated sources and amounts of MTW funding by FDS line item.		
Sources		
FDS Line Item	FDS Line Item Name	Dollar Amount
70500 (70300+70400)	Total Tenant Revenue	\$ 1,860,145
70600	HUD PHA Operating Grants	\$ 19,198,651
70610	Capital Grants	\$ 576,951
70700 (70710+70720+70730+70740+70750)	Total Fee Revenue	\$ -
71100+72000	Interest Income	\$ 10,775
71600	Gain or Loss on Sale of Capital Assets	\$ -
71200+71300+71310+71400+71500	Other Income	\$ 121,450
70000	Total Revenue	\$ 21,767,972

Estimated Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall provide the estimated uses and amounts of MTW spending by FDS line item.

Uses		
FDS Line Item	FDS Line Item Name	Dollar Amount
91000 (91100+91200+91400+91500+91600+91700+91800+91900)	Total Operating - Administrative	\$ 1,880,045
91300+91310+92000	Management Fee Expense	\$ 1,738,640
91810	Allocated Overhead	\$ -
92500 (92100+92200+92300+92400)	Total Tenant Services	\$ 250,106
93000 (93100+93600+93200+93300+93400+93800)	Total Utilities	\$ 858,891
93500+93700	Labor	\$ -
94000 (94100+94200+94300+94500)	Total Ordinary Maintenance	\$ 2,297,660
95000 (95100+95200+95300+95500)	Total Protective Services	\$ 22,950
96100 (96110+96120+96130+96140)	Total insurance Premiums	\$ 492,080
96000 (96200+96210+96300+96400+96500+96600+96800)	Total Other General Expenses	\$ 1,058,282
96700 (96710+96720+96730)	Total Interest Expense and Amortization Cost	\$ -
97100+97200	Total Extraordinary Maintenance	\$ -
97300+97350	Housing Assistance Payments + HAP Portability-	\$ 13,169,318
97400	Depreciation Expense	\$ 2,084,818
97500+97600+97700+97800	All Other Expenses	\$ -
90000	Total Expenses	\$ 23,852,790

Describe the Activities that Will Use Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

All of HACG's activities using the Single Fund Flexibility are done so in concert with other MTW waivers and/or described in either Section (III) Proposed MTW Activities or Section (IV) Approved MTW Activities.

Note: The apparent deficit of \$2,084,818 is depreciation expense; this is a non-cash expense.

B. MTW Plan: Local Asset Management Plan

Is the PHA allocating costs within statute?

☐ Yes

or

☐

Is the PHA implementing a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

☐

or

☐ No

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. The narrative shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

☐

or

☐ No

N/A

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE

A. RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE ANNUAL MTW PLAN:

The resolution adopting the Annual MTW Plan will be attached (see Appendix B).

B. BEGINNING AND ENDING DATES OF PLAN'S AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

The Annual MTW Plan was available for public review from February 27 – March 29
The plan was officially picked up on April 1 from the following locations:

- Columbus Public Library, 3000 Macon Road (reference desk, 2nd floor);
- Citizens Service Center, 3111 Citizens Way (Help Desk on 1st floor);
- HACG's Central Office, 1000 Wynnton Road (receptionist's desk);

Public Hearing/Meeting Dates	Public Hearing/Meeting Locations	Public Hearing/Meeting Attendees
Monday, March 17, 2014	1006 Wynnton Road, Columbus, GA - HACG Board Room	5
Wednesday, March 19, 2014	1006 Wynnton Road, Columbus, GA - HACG Board Room	15
Wednesday, March 19, 2014	1121 Fort Benning Road, Columbus, GA - Senior Nutrition Center	22
Tuesday, March 25, 2014	1901 Nina Street, Columbus, GA - Farley Community Room	17

Comments on the Annual MTW Plan are attached (see appendix D).

C. DESCRIPTION OF ANY PLANNED OR ONGOING AGENCY DIRECTED EVALUATIONS OF THE DEMONSTRATION:

HACG has contracted with CSU's Social Research Center to evaluate the following:

- Community Choice;
 - Effects of 40 community-wide vouchers at 120% of FMR;
 - Effects of 40 restricted vouchers at 120% of FMR in a low-poverty area;
 - Effects of 40 regular vouchers to serve as the control group.
- Innovations to Reduce Homelessness;
 - Number of homeless families that “stabilize” and transition to “self-sufficiency”;
- Rent Reform (Farley);
 - Effects of HACG providing incentives and tiered rent to a test group contrasted with a control group.

D. ANNUAL STATEMENT/PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION REPORT (50075.1)

- HACG's 2014 ACC (with Form 50075.1) was submitted to HUD on April 11, 2014 (see appendix E);
- HACG is operating off of the 2013 ACC, which was submitted to HUD on April 17, 2013 (see HUD Form 50075.2);
 - HACG received a letter of approval from HUD on November 3, 2013;
- Form 50075.1 for previous grants with open, unexpended funds are included in Appendix E as well.

APPENDIX